UNITED STATES COURTS EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK QUALITY CONTROL CHECK

ATTORNEY CASE OPENINGS

Corrections		
W	ere Corrections made to this ACO case?	No
1	Attorney did not complete the initiating documents. Checked on http://www.nyed.circ2.dcn/cfm/ecf/atyopencase.cfm to determine who the attorney was that attempted to file the case and contacted that attorney in order to retrieve Complaint, Cover Sheet, Summons, and payment information or to advise the attorney to file the initiating documents.	
2	Court Designation was incorrect. Copied case, changed Court designation, deleted incorrect case and advised other Court. This is in conjunction with Paragraph 10-NY-E Division of Business Rule 50.1(d)(2)	
3	Attorney did not separate the initiating document. Separated document into individual attachments. Replaced Main document and attached the cover sheet and Summons (if applicable).	
4	Attorney did not include Complaint Cover Sheet Summons Contacted attorney and retrieved missing document from attorney.	
5	Attorney used	
6	Attorney used incorrect event when docketing the initiating document. Deleted document and re-docketed using the correct event.	
7	Corrected Party Role Party spelling Added missing Party Over 100 Parties were not added to the docker Converted from All Caps to Initial Caps Added party text Removed party text Added alias	√
8	Corrected Short Title	
9	Corrected Basis of Jurisdiction Citizenship of Principal Parties Nature of Suit Cause of Action Fee Status County Code Dollar Demand Jury Demand Class Action Origin	
10	NY-E Division of Business Rule 50.1(d)(2) was not completed. Contacted attorney and retrieved corrected cover sheet and replaced on docket sheet.	
11	Added case in other court to docket sheet.	<u> </u>
12	Added/Corrected Disclosure Statement question and response in docket entry	$\vdash \vdash$
13	Page 1, Question 1(b) Plaintiff's county of residence was not indicated	┞╞╣╴
14	Page 2, Question 2(c) was not completed or is inconsistent	
Other	Certification of Arbitration Eligibility not completed 1)Defendant Credit Agricole Corporate & Investment Bank, New York Branch represented by Credit Agricole Corporate & Investment Bank, New York Branch was listed as a pro se plaintiff on the case 2)Defendant-HSBC Holdings plc represented by HSBC Holdings plc was listed as a pro se defendant	V